

WELCOME VOICES FROM SCOTLAND

ed, and Cuba, and great numbers of slaves have be

being weakened and corrupted by long repression and servitude, the Italians have shown themselves instantly qualified for good government—to devise it, to administer it, and to live under it. Every part of Italy has yielded men worthy to help to organize the nation; men of thought and learning, men of sense and observation, men of conscience and the simplest disinterestedness. They showed in tears to reap in joy; and the slaves they now bring with them are genuine bread of life for the people. I need not enlarge on the converse case. For purposes of convenience, a vice was involved in the republican scheme of America; what were calamity could have produced consequences so fearful! The world was all before them—those founders of the Republic; they had freedom at their command; and they believed that their posterity would always have freedom at their command; but this one element of vice has destroyed not only the polity in which it was enfolded, but the national character and reputation. Tyranny has been driving out freedom, year by year; passion has made children of the citizens on the one hand, and cowardice has made slaves of them on the other. If the old spirit of liberty and patriotism still exists, where is it hiding? How is it that tyrants, traitors and cowards bear rule, and represent the nation to the world, and that the faithful few—the Abolitionists—have been struggling against all the forces of society all these years, to uphold the standard under which the national independence was achieved? It has so happened because indulgence in any admitted vice casts out the very life of a nation as of an individual's heart. A noble and long-cherished aspiration has made a great nation of the Italians in an hour. A submission to a vice has lowered the American nation, in three-quarters of a century, to a point at which speeches like Mr. Seward's are adventured by a foremost man in the State, and tolerated and even applauded by legislators and some of the people whom they represent. It could not have been worse, and it might have been better, for the nation to have been living under the iron rule of an Austria all this time than under the constraint of a great crime. The national spirit might have been wounded there; but it is poisoned now; and that is surely worse. All is not lost, however, while there are ten righteous men who may save the city. We know of them; and let us hope there may be tens of thousands still. If anything can bring them out into the field, it will surely be the treatment the Abolitionists have met with in the cities where their townsmen have delighted to exalt them to the high places of honor.

Among the effects produced here by your revolution one is, that tory newspapers assume that your troubles are the result of popular government. They represent this as a fact; and it is for the purpose of damaging the enterprise of parliamentary reform at home. The *Times* takes the lead in representing the Republic as broken up by liberty, and not by slavery. The ignorance shown in this, and in many other matters of importance lately, has drawn much attention to the faults of the great newspaper; and the cynical *Saturday Review*, itself liable to the same kind of judgment, has given to the blunders of the *Times* the name of "the happy-go-lucky brigade"—a title which will stick. There is a world of talk and activity about growing cotton in a dozen countries; and no doubt we shall soon—in a very few years—be in a condition to sustain our manufactures without supplies from America. Our recent news from India reports of "wild orders for cotton" being received at Bombay. Thus we shall soon know what India can yield at present.

You will have learned that the announcement of the emancipation of the Russian serfs on New Year's day (copied into the *Liberator*) was a mistake. The facts, up to our latest telegrams, are these. The emancipation was promised from one quarter of a year to another; and it was known here to be impossible because the requisite measures had not been taken. It did not happen, as promised, in October; nor in January. Then it was promised for February—the present month. Now, the promise is that the proclamation shall be issued in March, and that the emancipation will be appointed for next October. This is the latest form of promise; but some intelligence came with it which bodes ill. The Council of State is discussing the Emperor's scheme; and the only practical point yet arrived at has been reversed by the Council. The clauses thus far considered have been those in which the general principles of the case are embodied—with one more. That one declared that the directors throughout the empire should be elected by the communes. The Council has set aside this all-important provision, and substituted for the election, appointment by seigniorial authority. I need not explain the importance of this indication. When the Emperor has carried his point, and satisfied the world as to what the point is, we may rejoice. And we may rejoice now that the matter has gone too far for retraction; but, in climbing this lofty summit of human welfare, let us not about till we are beyond the range of the avalanche. The present is, perhaps, as critical a day for the Russian polity as for the American; and the more we know of the difficulties in each case, and of the parties who should be doing steadily a very plain duty, the more doubtful the issue appears.

The meeting of the first Italian Parliament is full compensation for many political doubts and sorrows. It is, perhaps, the great event of the century. We shall see soon what the new French liberties amount to. At present, it seems as if they were the Emperor's resource under perplexity and dread from the scandals of his financial connections, and his breach with the priests. Time will show whether anything can be made of a boon so occasioned, or whether it is the purchase-money of further liberty of aggression on his neighbors. The last thing conceivable is that he confers liberty in reality, and for his own sake. Gaeta has fallen, in spite of his effort to prolong the struggle; and he bears the stain of all the blood that was shed during the period of his intervention.

LETTERS FROM PARIS. No. XXVI.
PARIS, February 21, 1861.

The European affairs of the present hour, important as they are, sink almost into insignificance when compared to the American crisis, and we are watching with the deepest interest the progress of events on the other side of the Atlantic. What a singular spectacle do we witness! A regular election, made after all the constitutional forms, without bloodshed or violence, immediately followed by the open rebellion of the minority; the hands of the Union broken by the very people who had always, in the name of the Union, claimed so many sacrifices from the North; and, on the other hand, the conquering party, almost afraid of its own victory, and perhaps too willing to abandon all the fruits of it, by a compromise which might secure for centuries the omnipotence of the pro-slavery interest; between the two, a corrupted and weak central government, unable and unwilling to enforce the laws. The furious insanity of the South will, I hope, carry everything before it, and not leave room for the cowardly attempts of the statesmen who are ready to bargain for right and wrong, and to pay with the blood of millions for the continuance of a so-called Union which their enemies do not respect. It is full time that the North and South should separate; such a disunion is marked by nature. In the North, we find all that the wisdom of centuries, the experience of mankind, has been able to produce; an ideal form of government, the most admirable development of the different parts of the political body; a moral, well instructed, religious, laborious people. In the South, we find only the gross, stupid kind of barbarism, one race reducing another to slavery, and right and wrong, family ties, religion, suppressed in favor of a reigning minority. Montagu, the immortal writer of the *Esprit des Loix*, would himself find something to learn in the New England towns and villages, and might, if he could revise his great work, add thereto a new chapter; but he would only turn with disgust from a Southern plantation. When De Tocqueville wrote his famous work upon American democracy, he had only to note the admirable results worked by the culture of the North, and slavery appeared to him like a dark shadow upon the admirable construction of Franklin and Washington. Recently, F. Lacordaire, when received as a Member of the French Academy, drew a parallel between the American democracy and the European democracy, and left all the advantage on the side of America. As his speech was read just at the time when the first dissolution of news arrived, everybody ridiculed Lacordaire's enthusiasm for American democracy. I still believe that it was right in praising as he did the American ideal of politics, respect of the law, respect for the people's rights, a deep sense of the importance of education, hatred of war and bloodshed; but these praises only apply to the Northern ideal. Where Garrison, Emerson, and Theodore Parker, and the Abolitionists, have lived

and do live, there is America, there is the American soul. The North and the South have been like two rivers, one pure, springing from granitic mountains, the other poisoned and muddy. These two rivers have been forced to mix their waters; let them flow separately, and you will soon recognize how different their waters are. What has a Northern confederation, the centre of free emigration, of intellectual improvement, of material and mechanical progress, to fear from a few cotton States which military despotism only will be able to keep together, and where insecurity of life and property will soon reduce the white population to its minimum? Northern people must look in the face of disunion, and they will no longer be afraid of it. There are times when a man must choose his way, and when moderation is no more moderation, but weakness. Think of King Victor Emmanuel, when he began the war for Italy; what many conflicting reasons must have agitated his mind; but over all these he saw one idea, and followed it. What is the use of sentimental speeches about the Union, the Constitution, and so forth? Do but say to yourselves, Slavery is hateful, we have been rendered responsible for it by our Union with the South, but the South now chooses to break the Union, our responsibility ceases from this day. We do not violate the laws, we do not call for violence; but if our enemies break the ties of union, this is no reason why we should give up our constitutional victory, all our principles, and the very destinies of the republic. Mr. Seward, by his action in the Senate, has covered himself with shame; and it gives me much pleasure to observe the consistent and honest attitude of Charles Sumner, who won so many friends here during the time of his illness. The American affairs take more space than usual in our French papers. The opinion is unanimous against the South. There is but one writer who takes the side of the slaveholder, M. Granier, who calls himself De Cassagnac; but I must add that he is one of the most despised of his class, and that his opinions are of no importance whatever. Victor Hugo has just published an engraving which attracts much attention. It represents the execution of John Brown. In a very dark sky one sees nothing but the faint outline of the martyr, hanging from the gibbet; one ray of light comes from heaven over his head. The French are very much struck and poetical.

Our own European affairs are much entangled. Italy, fortunately, seems to have a good wind in her sails. Gaeta is taken, and the French troops will, I hope, soon leave Rome. Think of the city of the seven hills being the capital of a constitutional kingdom. In France there is nothing new—"Il n'y a qu'un message de plus." I mean to say that all the promises made by the Imperial decree prove to be nothing. Fifteen days after having promised some degree of liberty to the press, Persigny has sent an *arrêté* to the *Courier du Dimanche*, and has exiled the director of it, a foreigner, whose name is Ganeco. In the Senate, there has been a most interesting discussion upon the new system. The President of the Senate, M. Troplong (whose speeches always are *trop longs*), said, in an elaborate report, that books were sufficient for the expression of public opinion! As for papers, they must be submitted to peculiar restrictions; the regime of the periodical press, therefore, ought to remain what it is; and, said he, with satisfaction, "the government has promised that it should not be changed." Speaking of the right given to the two Houses to make a reply to the speech of the throne, he says that "the Addresses, instead of being a field of battle, will only contain loyal and patriotic information on the state of the country. Discussion will have for its object to instruct the power, not to overthrow it. The Ministers will only be responsible to the Emperor, and will not be the representatives of a majority whom another majority could dismiss." "Recently," says this interesting document, "people have thought that we were on the eve of changing our political system and of adopting constitutional institutions, of which the country knows the weakness and the danger. These thoughts were vain phantoms and mere illusions." So much for the people who might think that empire means liberty! You must remember that the man who was uttering these sentiments was the most important political functionary of the State, the President of the Senate. What is to be expected from a Senate which has applauded such things, and given to the report of the President a minority consisting of two men? The right principles are embodied in the right men; imperial slaves will never be the agents of a constitutional government.

Our Philadelphia Correspondence.
PHILADELPHIA, March 18, 1861.

Your leader and my incidental paragraph on the Inaugural have been the occasion of divers strictures, not over complimentary to either of us. I have no wish to reopen the discussion, but a few general observations, naturally suggested, will not be deemed impertinent.

The character of a paper does not stand upon a single editorial, nor is the tenor of its correspondence to be judged from an occasional letter. The words and acts of public men may or may not deserve censure, according to the point of view from which they are regarded, or the rule by which it is sought to determine their character. Everything goes by comparison. We are agreeably or painfully disappointed, according as more have been looking for nothing; while much more will disappoint among whose expectations have been larger.

These general principles ought to be borne in mind, whether it is the President's Inaugural or your paper's strictures thereupon that is the subject of criticism. It is your duty, being set for the purpose, to hold the standard high; it is none the less your correspondent's privilege, if he should so choose, to express gratitude for small favors. And if you once in a great while, and he more frequently, should over-do the matter, your readers will remember that *errare est*—fallibility is one of the incidents of our nature.

You will see I make a difference between the responsibility of an editor and that of a mere correspondent. The latter may take liberties not accorded to the former. He may give more vent to his feelings. He may express—within bounds, to be sure—vexation or jubilation, just as he may happen, from causes before him, to be in the mood. But not so the editor. The impersonality of his position forbids the manifestation of individual feeling. He must be dispassionate, and, in his leaders at least, must treat all subjects with judicial impartiality. He must hold the balance even. He must neither make haste to judge, nor must he postpone judgment.

My dear friend, I am glad that it is you and not I that sit on the tripod; for another difficulty of your position is, that you have to be oracular as well as judicial. Now a correspondent is allowed to accommodate himself to "the shifting scenes," and to say one thing one week and another thing another, just as appearances at the time may indicate. Such, at least, is the general usage of the craft, though I do not say that this correspondent avails himself of the accorded privilege.

I don't want to be tedious, but on this subject of just judgment, I am, in the language of the Inaugural, "loath to close." It is a matter that lies at the base of our movement, and involves a principle of action, a right apprehension of which is essential to all right conduct. There is a class who are continually saying, "Don't judge, it is wrong to judge," etc., who simply mean by this, "Don't judge unfavorably." You may, for all they care, express a judgment of approval; you may even speak in terms of high praise, and they will find no fault; but lift your voice in condemnation, and then is sure to come in this self-assumed plea for charity, "Don't judge, it is wrong to judge." If this be not simple nonsense, it is because it is something worse. Indiscriminate praise is no less to be deprecated than indiscriminate censure. Indeed, it is more; for it does more harm. Unjust censure provokes resistance and reacts on the accuser, thus often curing itself on the spot. But undue praise, falling in with the best feelings of our nature, as praise is apt to do, meets no dissent, and thus gradually evil is put for good, and the sanctions of virtue made to cover the deformities of sin. Conscientiousness is an ugly feature of character, but false charity is no improvement upon it. Has it never occurred to you, when these sticklers for forbearance have been deprecating judgment, that they have been saying two words for themselves to one for their subject? "Judge not" is a good Scriptural injunction; but Scripture is to be interpreted by Scripture, and the same authority that says, "Judge not," says also, "Judge righteous judgment."

But coming back to THE STANDARD—for these thoughts have been a digression—there is a feature in its character which I think is not fully appreciated. I allude to the intelligence its columns evince in regard to all the political movements of the day—in this country, and in Europe as well. It is not a political paper, neither is it a "religious" one, and yet there is no other journal in the land, better "posted," as the phrase is, on all questions, political and ecclesiastical, that claim public attention. Between your excellent Washington correspondent and your own busy pen and scissors, your readers have a fair reward every week of all that is important to be known in the political happenings of this country, while the letters of your London, Dublin, and Paris correspondents give us a general idea—all we can take in—of what is going on in the same line abroad. The scope of observation and minuteness of knowledge exhibited by "H. M." on the great political questions of the day in both hemispheres, is a continual challenge to my admiration. The more so, as, by necessity of her sex, this distinguished writer and reformer is precluded from what would be called an active part and personal interest in the political arrangements of society.

The equal participation of women with men in our anti-slavery movement has been made an objection to our organization on the score of efficiency. It is admitted that, in view of the moral aspects of the question, men and women stand on the same level; but, in its political aspects—the ones which now mainly present themselves—it is contended that women, not having the same motive to interest and inform themselves, must be disqualified for equal coadjutorship. In reply to this we are content to point to HARRIET MARTINEAU, of England, to ANNY KELLEY FOSTER of this country, and to SEAN B. ANTHONY, ELIZABETH H. JONES, and other noble women not a few, in vindication of our policy. No anti-slavery lecturer in the field has ever delivered original dissertations on the party aspects of the question, than have been delivered in this city and elsewhere by Mrs. A. K. Foster. I am inclined to think that if the Abolitionists of this country were to select from their ranks the person best fitted, in their judgment, for usefulness in the higher walks of diplomacy, their choice would rest on a woman. The notion that women are disqualified for the discharge of state duties is a relic of barbarism. That they can render powerful, not to say equal, assistance with the more muscular sex, in revolutionizing the politics of a country, is a fact which no longer admits of question.

In ecclesiastics, as well as in politics, as already intimated, THE STANDARD is equally competent, by its stores of information, to enlighten its readers. Your "C. K. W." keeps us apprised of everything that is going on of interest in the religious world on the subject of slavery; and that takes in everything of real importance, at the present moment, in the sayings and doings of the Church and Clergy.

It is a somewhat singular fact, that the Abolitionists, though non-jurors in politics, and—the best of them—"come-outers" in religion, disperse more useful knowledge in regard to Churches and parties, priests and politicians, than does perhaps any other body of people. They have demonstrated their own proposition: That it is possible to shape the course of a party, to dictate the policy of a state, to agitate, sift and dissolve a Church, without being either politicians, citizens, clergymen or communicating members. Great is Truth! and Abolition is its prophet. "Truth is stronger than all things"; who can resist its progress, or what withstand its power?

In my last, the hope was expressed that our Solons at Washington would not hinder the blessings which Heaven was ready to bestow upon us. When the long-looked for hour is extended to us of deliverance from slaveholding rule and slave-driving bloodguiltiness, may we not be permitted to accept it? Present appearances, I am pleased to say, favor the idea that, whether from virtue or necessity, we shall at last be constrained to pursue in this matter, the course of wisdom. The following is from a Washington despatch:

"There are Republicans here, of high political standing, who assert both knowingly and positively that the secret of the unexpected consent of Gov. Chase and other radical members of the Cabinet to the surrender of Fort Sumter, is their firm belief in the inevitability of the ultimate division of the country into two confederacies, one entirely free labor, the other slaveholding, and their desire to bring about the separation without bloodshed. That this idea has been broached in Cabinet council is certain."

There is one thing, if nothing more, to be said in favor of our new Cabinet; they are competent to keep their own counsels. Such impassable reticence is something new at Washington. To the demand of friend and foe, as to what are their plans and purposes, the members of the government are alike inexorable. This is right. It has been objected to a democratic form of government, that it cannot, in time of war, act with secrecy and dispatch. The history of this administration, so far as it can be done in so short a space, proves that this objection is, at most, only half true. Whether, when it does move, it will act with an energy sufficient to make up for its tardiness—that being the argument in behalf of a popular government—remains to be seen. It must be admitted that, on this point, there is some doubt and a good deal of anxiety.

The time was when the mere fact of Mr. Seward's being chief adviser to the Executive would have imparted a strong degree of confidence to the friends of freedom; but now the effect is rather the contrary. By his foolish-wise course of late, this astute statesman has made even his friends feel doubts of him. They don't much doubt that all his talk of concession was mere make-believe, intended to lead suspicion and gain time; but still there is a little under-current of fear that he may have been in earnest, and that at this very time, with his great powers of influencing others, he has been concocting some plan of surrender on the part of the North as the means of recovering the seceded States. This idea unhappily gains favor from the fatuous way in which he has taken occasion to speak of the Union. The freedom that is "always in the Union" is not the freedom, as they understand it, that anti-slavery men have been bargaining for. "What does Mr. Seward mean by this sort of talk?" they ask with painful solicitude. One of the curses of cunning is, that a man who resorts to it loses the confidence of his friends as well as of his enemies. Strategy is no part of true statesmanship. Reticence may be advised by wisdom, but dissimulation never. If a man can't speak the truth, when he is solicited, without doing more harm than good, let him hold his tongue.

If it were not for this Machiavelian policy (for I can't think it is anything worse) of Mr. Seward, the people would now have occasion to feel comparatively easy as to the administration of public affairs. With Lincoln and Hamlin at the head of the government, and Seward, Chase, Welles, Bates, and Blair in the Cabinet; with Fessenden and Wade, Sumner and Wilson, Wilcox and King, and the like, in the Senate, and Lieutenant-General Scott in command of the army; with Charles Francis Adams, William L. Dayton, Cassius M. Clay, and the others of the same character to represent us at foreign Courts, and men such as the President and Senate may approve to administer the offices of trust and power at home, we ought to be allowed to feel a more peaceful sense of security as to the course of our political ship than at this time generally cherished. The apprehension that prevails just does not so much to distrust the officers in command as of the vessel itself. The old hulk is not seaworthy; or, to come back to the President's more appropriate figure, the "machine," as he finds it, is hard to be made to "run." Some of its screws are loose; some of its timbers are rotten; there is an inherent defect in its construction, and the whole thing is rickety. If Mr. Lincoln and his journeyman will tighten it up, and replace its rusty pins and bands with sound ones; if they will remove the decayed parts as useless, and guard against disturbing forces, and undue friction in those that remain; if they will, after the example of Jefferson and his advisers, assume a little extra-constitutional authority, and mend the machine a trifle, he will find it much easier to "run," and the people will approve his work and applaud his engineering.

Of course, as an honest man, a President ought to abide by the Constitution, according to its intent and meaning; but he must beware of a too literal as well as of a too liberal construction. The boot is made for the foot, not the foot for the boot; if it is too tight, it must be stretched. So of the Constitution. Mr. Lincoln's duty—so at least some reason—is to stretch the Constitution to the extent that may be needed to carry the purpose for which it was made. If it break in the process, so much the worse for the Constitution. It only shows that it ought to be broken. Certainly, if Mr. Lincoln hamper himself needlessly by a narrow interpretation of his duties, he will in so doing show that he is not "the right man in the right place." X.

Our Washington Correspondence.

WASHINGTON, March 18, 1861.

It is exceedingly difficult to ascertain the policy of the Administration towards the seceded States, and for the best of reasons—the Administration has not yet settled what its policy shall be. But it must do so very soon, or the government will be destroyed. There is no use in denying that the seceders have played their game adroitly, and at every step thus far have beaten the government of the United States. Their last great triumph is the surrender by President Lincoln of Fort Sumter into their hands. This act will cause a more general rejoicing throughout the cotton States than any other in their history. But it is unfair to make Mr. Lincoln responsible for it. He has no more to do with the surrender of Fort Sumter than he has with the prevalence of diphtheria in the country. Sumter could have been reinforced three months ago—yes, two months ago—but Mr. Buchanan would not do it, well knowing what the result would be. He must take the entire responsibility of its surrender, for the course he deliberately followed led as certainly to its evacuation as if he had sent written orders to Major Anderson at a certain day to abandon it.

But while Mr. Lincoln yields to a military necessity at this point, it is absolutely necessary that he should have a bold policy one way or the other respecting the great rebellion. He must either take steps for the early recognition of the Southern Confederacy, or call upon Congress for aid in his attempt to execute the laws. To go on as we now are going will very soon bring this government to embarrassment and utter disgrace. This government has a high tariff—the Montgomery affair a low one; and European goods will be sure to find their way into the United States by the way of Charleston, Mobile, and New Orleans. The *Evening Post* states the case forcibly:

"The importers arriving at the Southern harbors will know how to address the custom-house officers. 'We have a cargo,' they will naturally say, 'on which we do not care to pay duties just at present; we must deposit it in the warehouses for the term during which we are permitted to do so by law.' What will the collector do? He will be obliged to let it go without the duties. The government has no longer any warehouses in the seceding ports. The hold of an armed vessel would neither be a proper nor a sufficiently spacious repository for the goods. The collector will be puzzled to know whether to let the ship proceed to her port or to detain her."

We happen to know that there are importing houses at this moment preparing to take advantage of this opening for an unembarrassed trade. They are getting ready to convey their cargoes to Charleston or Savannah; the goods will be landed there, and then brought coastwise to New York, where, being importations from a port within the Union, they will be subject to no duty. The collector will be puzzled to know whether to let the ship proceed to her port or to detain her."

What is Mr. Lincoln going to do about it? His treasury will soon be bankrupt, unless measures are taken to enforce the revenue laws, or to recognize the slave republic. The moment that we acknowledge the new republic, we can provide against the introduction of foreign goods on the frontier. Notice what the staid and conservative New York *Commercial Advertiser* says:

"We have no hesitation in saying that the recognition of the Southern Confederacy should not be delayed a day longer than can be helped after once Fort Sumter has been surrendered to the rebels. Anderson's retreat from that fortress, it will be irrevocably gone from the Federal government of the United States. No one dreams that it, or any other fort, will be retaken after this."

So, you see, we seem to be drifting toward an irrevocable "dissolution of the Union." Unless the government instantly asserts itself, such a result cannot be averted. But how shall the government assert itself? The President cannot legally collect the revenues on board men of war, nor can he close the Southern ports. Congress would give him power, undoubtedly; but it is evident that the President does not care for an extra session, unless he is compelled to it. There are many excellent reasons why he should not desire one. In the first place, it would set the compromise business going instantly. Now, we are safe till next December, at least, and by that time a compromise will be too late. For this reason, the anti-slavery Republicans dislike the idea of an extra session, while for another—the passage of new force measures—they favor it. The Conservatives and Compromisers are in the same predicament, for they too wish and do not wish an extra session. The question must soon be decided.

The Senate has vacated certain Senatorial seats, and directed the Secretary to erase certain names from his list. The singular selection of names thus stricken from the roll—it will appear singular to the people generally—was made because the Senators singled out declared openly in the Senate their purpose of leaving that body, and followed the declaration by actual absence. The other seceding Senators made no such declaration, and therefore it was thought best not to declare their seats vacant.

Mr. Douglas is trying very hard to coax and drive the government along his path of compromise and concession. He starts out with the proposition that we have not the power to overcome secession by force, and secondly, that it would not be desirable to execute the laws by force if we could. Then comes his "thirdly"—therefore we must keep the Union together by conceding everything which slavery demands! This is the Douglas plan of "saving the Union." Will Mr. Seward adopt it? Will Mr. Lincoln follow Mr. Seward's advice about it, or will he give his ear to Mr. Chase? These are questions to be answered ere long. Douglas knows very well that after a single blow is struck—after a battle—his hope of preserving the old Union, or reconstructing it, is gone. So he cries for peace, thinking that, with peace, compromise is sure eventually to gain the victory. But he overlooks one important fact, to wit, that the people of the free States are getting sick of the Union-saving business, especially as every slave State professes to hold to the doctrine of secession, which of itself makes the Union and the government a mere nullity. The people of the North and West are studying this matter leisurely, and instead of making wicked concessions to traitors and rebels, will soon declare their willingness to allow their "Southern brethren" to depart from the Union in peace. This is the tendency of things now, as the recent able editorial in the New York *Commercial Advertiser* will show. If the government has no power to exert its authority over the seceded States, let them be acknowledged, and the line be drawn between the republic of freedom and the republic of slavery—the quicker the better.

It is thought that the Cabinet, as it is now constituted, cannot long hold together. It is supposed that such men as Chase, Blair, and Welles will be naturally opposed to the policy of Seward, Cameron, Smith, and Beane. But it must be remembered that the compromise question will not be likely ever to get into the Cabinet. Mr. Lincoln is not going to try to bribe any measures through Congress, no matter of what character they may be. On the question of the proper defence of the government the Cabinet is a unit, and that is about the only question connected with partisan politics which will be agitated in the Cabinet. So that while Messrs. Seward and Chase would have been very easy of disagreeing in the Senate, it is not probable that they will differ in the Cabinet. The Republicans may split up in Congress, but the Cabinet will stand.

The savage onslaught of Douglas upon the Republicans, on Friday, in the Senate, and especially his set-to with Mr. Fessenden, reminded some of his hearers of the old times when he was working as hard to get the Missouri compromise repealed, as he now is working to make a new one with his Southern masters. He was exceedingly vulgar and abusive. He told Mr. Fessenden that he *knowingly* lied, and was offensive in his manners towards other Senators. Mr. Fessenden certainly had his revenge, for Mr. Douglas never before, probably, received so thorough a drubbing in his life. It was performed coolly, scientifically, and classically. I will not attempt to give you the exact language of the passage between them, but here is the substance:

"You lie, and know you lie," says Douglas. "I do not reply to such language as that," replies Fessenden, "for no gentleman uses it." Then Douglas gets off a hint respecting the code. "Everybody knows," Fessenden does not acknowledge "the code." So he replies, "None but a coward will deliberately insult a man who he knows does not acknowledge the code." For ten minutes the Maine Senator went on in the coolest manner imaginable, giving a slight hinting of the coarseness, egotism, and brutality of the Illinois demagogue. Times are changed since Douglas used to insult Sumner and Chase with impunity, and he made no headway in the use of his old weapons. Even his Democratic friends did not come to his aid, and seemed not to care for the issue of the contest. Indeed, three or four of the Southern Senators were much delighted with the

punishment administered to the man whom nobody, North or South, dares to trust.

Douglas means to smash up the Republican party, and suppose that the Seward wing will join him in forming a grand Union, pro-slavery party. But his Friday's effort was a terrible mistake. He was so coarse and abusive that everybody present who makes the slightest pretensions to Republicanism was disgusted. But the Little Giant will not give it up so. He feels sure that ere long he can divide the Republican party in two, and that the Weed wing of it will readily join him and other Democrats in the compromise policy. So Douglas goes in very shrewdly for a peaceable separation of the slave from the free States. Let us have compromise, cries Douglas, but if not that, then peaceable disunion. He knows that war makes the separation final, or at least till slavery is overthrown. But if the separation is peaceful, he expects in time to commence the work of reconstruction upon a pro-slavery basis. Nor is he a fool in entertaining such expectations. The North loves the Almighty Dollar, and it is not impossible, I fear not improbable, that a reaction may come, under the influence of which a reaction may come, and the Constitution might be formed, far more dishonorable than those made by our fathers. If disunion comes, if the separation becomes perfect, the anti-slavery men of the country cannot lay down their arms, even for an hour, till slavery has no existence upon this continent.

SHERMAN M. BOOTH LIBERATED.—Our readers will be gratified to learn that the imprisonment of Sherman M. Booth is at an end, and not less surprised to hear that his prison door was opened by James Buchanan. The Milwaukee *Free Democrat* of March 11th says:

"On going to the post-office yesterday morning, Marshal Lewis received an official document from the hand of Buchanan, dated March 24, 1861, remitting the sentence of Sherman M. Booth, charged with treason, and went to the county jail of this county, and informed the custodian he had a free man imprisoned there. 'It is equitable to say that Mr. Booth was surprised at this action on the part of one who has been so recreant to the rights of freedom, so devoted to the interests of slavery, throughout his term. On only one hypothesis have we an explanation to the proceeding, viz., that having expressed an intention to join the Church and be a better man the rest of his short term of life, Mr. Buchanan thought it best to invite Divine consideration by one act of simple justice in an executive capacity. Be this as it may, Sherman M. Booth enjoys the pure air and sunlight without any intervening bars and bolts, and there are few citizens of Wisconsin who will not rejoice with us that the hand of oppression has been removed from him.'

FOREIGN MINISTERS.—We have already announced the appointment of Thomas Corwin of Ohio as United States Minister to Mexico, and of Cassius M. Clay to Spain. We have now to announce the following:

Minister to England—CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, of Mass.
Minister to France—WILLIAM L. DAYTON, of New Jersey.
Minister to Italy—GEORGE P. MARSH, of Vermont.
Minister to Turkey—JAMES WATSON WEBB, of New York.
Minister to Austria—ANSON BURLINGAME, of Massachusetts.
Minister to Denmark—BRADFORD R. WOOD, of Albany.
Minister to Belgium—HENRY S. SANFORD, of Connecticut.
Minister to London—FREDERICK M. MORSE, of Maine.
Minister to Rome—REVERE KING, of Wisconsin.
Commissioner to Sandwich Islands—THOMAS J. DRYDEN, of Oregon.

Minister to Havana—JAMES O. POTNAM, of New York.

It is believed that Carl Schurz will be nominated for the mission to Portugal.

The constituents of Mr. Adams will take good care, we trust, to elect as his successor an uncompromising friend of freedom.

ESCAPE OF A VILLAIN.—Capt. Lathan, of the slave Cora, confined in the Eldridge street prison for a felony in violating the laws against the slave trade, and whose guilt was so clear as to make his conviction almost certain, has been allowed, by the connivance of a Deputy Marshal, if not of Capt. Rynders himself, to escape. The scoundrel is said to be wealthy, and he has undoubtedly bribed those whose duty it was to keep him in safe custody for trial. The laws against the slave trade, in the present state of public opinion in regard to slavery, are a mere sham.

NEW HAMPSHIRE, at the election recently held there, chose Judge Berry (an Abolitionist many years ago) for Governor, by nearly 4,000 majority, elected a Legislature strongly Republican in both branches, and chose three Republican Members of Congress (the whole delegation). The Democrats and Bell-Everett men made a united and desperate effort to carry the State, hoping that the revolutionary movements at the South had frightened a large portion of the Republican party.

THE HUTCHINSONS.—These sweet-singing friends of freedom," says our Philadelphia correspondent, "are giving great satisfaction by their concert. John's voice has improved in richness and compass; as has his sister Abby's (Mrs. Patton's) in a still greater degree. They are to sing next Monday evening (the 25th) in Sanson Hall, for the benefit of the 'Statistical Association of Colored People.'

THE COLLECTORSHIP OF THE PORT OF PHILADELPHIA has not yet been given—whatever may be the intention—to Wm. B. Thomas. Our correspondent accepted too recently the report current, when he stated the appointment to be a fact. Ex-Governor Pollock of Milton and Thomas Webster, Esq., of Philadelphia, are among the candidates for the place.

THE SLAVE TRADE AND THE AMERICAN FLAG.—Read the speech of Lord John Russell in another part of this sheet, noting especially his allusion to the latest phase of the correspondence between the British and American governments in relation to this subject.

ERRATUM.
To the Editor of THE NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

DEAR SIR: Deprecating your trouble, I beg you to understand that you, not I, have the responsibility of making Macbeth talk bad grammar in the line quoted in my letter. My chronology is distinct, and I am quite sure that if you will turn to the manuscript you will find that I wrote:

"And damned be he who first cries, *Hold, enough!*"

Now try your own eyes on your proof-reader and show your impartiality. Lincoln's offence was much the less stripe-worthy. A SINCERE FRIEND.
Philadelphia, March 16, 1861.

Having read the above lines, we rushed after the proof-reader, with editorial tabs uplifted, determined to administer, with judicial firmness, the punishment due to his ignorance and presumption. Ere the first blow had fallen, he cried, "Strike, but hear me," and, we restraining our indignation for the moment, allowed the culprit to make his defence. Laying his hand, somewhat nervously, upon an elegant copy of Shakespeare, he turned to the tragedy of Macbeth, act v, scene vii, and pointed triumphantly to the line—

"And damn'd be he who first cries, *Hold, enough!*"

The laws fell from our hand, whereupon the proof-reader, taking heart, boldly declared that if he had been ever so "stripe-worthy" for making the change referred to, the offence would have been more than counterbalanced by his magnanimity in supplying a comma omitted by our correspondent, the absence of which would have made nonsense of Macbeth's words. Unable to deny that there was an essential difference between "Hold enough" and "Hold, enough," we were constrained to own that the accused was at least even with "A Sincere Friend." Can our correspondent censure us for too great clemency if we own that we had not the heart to inflict upon the proof-reader a single stripe?

OBITUARY.
DIED, in Acworth, N.H., on the 14th inst., Rev. BROOKS WATTS, aged 58 years. He was for a long period the pastor of the Congregational Church in Acworth, N.H. After his resignation of that office, he labored as a missionary in various places in New Hampshire and Vermont, where his memory will be long and gratefully cherished.

The modern degeneration of the New England pulpit in regard to slavery never reached him. He was the first testimony of Garrison against slavery as a sin, his first call for immediate emancipation. He had a deep sense of the guilt of the American Church and Ministry in regard to slavery, and a great admiration for Dr. Chetver on account of his fidelity in exposing their sin. For many years, till his dying day, he was a careful and deeply interested reader of this paper.

Summary.

THE BROTHERS are all an impulsive, odd race, doing good as they feel moved, without much regard to prescribed methods. It is told of Rev. Thomas K. Beecher, brother of Henry Ward, that, walking through Emma's, N. H., he saw a poor woman who had been robbed of her money. He immediately went to her, and, after a search, found a small ministerial purse which he had lost the day before. He immediately gave it to her, and, before the widow's door, and saved her from a two men—his pay coming out of the Rev. Beecher's pocket.

ATTEMPTED INSURRECTION.—We have just received news from Kinney, Alabama, that a most damnable plot has been detected, and that the rebels have been furnished with arms and ammunition by white incendiaries, for the purpose of servile insurrection. The whole plot was ultimately discovered, and the incendiaries, who were in human shape, who prompt the happy and contented negro to deeds of blood and violence, should be dealt with to the extreme penalty of the law.—*Atlanta Intelligence*.

PROSECUTION.—They have recently passed in force the new law against secret societies of colored persons in Maryland, at Hagerstown. The penalty is a fine of \$50 for the first offence, and for the second, to be sold as a slave for life out of the State. Slaves offending to be sold out of the State, or punished by whipping. Banning for such societies punishable by a fine of \$500, or confinement in the penitentiary from five to ten years. The parties arrested are members of a benevolent society of many years' standing.

Mrs. JEFF, WON'T YOU TAKE A DRINK?—"Charles," said a Polish gentleman to his friend, "I have been told 'to go the agreeable' to his excellency Gen. Darius on his way to Montgomery, Ala., and imagining it would be a safe way to approach him with a complimentary toast, I said, 'Mrs. Jeff, won't you take a drink?'"

With a suavity of manner and good breeding that distinguished him from the vulgar Washingtonian, the President replied, "No, sir, I thank you!" and resumed his conversation.

The above is from a Montgomery paper, and is characterized as an amusing incident.

STAMPED BY NEGROES.—I spoke above of a stampede of negroes having taken place on Tuesday. I regret that I have been somewhat general lately; and though the account of them for some reason seems to be in the Southern papers, yet I have reason to know that I say to be true. A person connected with the night train of the Charleston Railroad, who was travelling with a large intelligence which makes me fear that there is considerable disaffection among the negroes in the centre of the State, from whom that train is made up, has just been sent home from his masters, and their consequent ill treatment by overseers—men who, never having had servants, and not how to treat them.—*Charleston Letter to the Enquirer*.

GREAT EXCITEMENT IN LOUISIANA.—Says the Baton Rouge (La.) Gazette of the 24th inst.: "We are assured on good authority that a gang of runaway negroes, about four hundred in number, are now in the hands of the police, on the property of citizens living on the eastern side

